

FLIPCHART NOTES  
GULF OF MEXICO ALLIANCE REGIONAL RESTORATION COORDINATION  
TEAM MEETING, DAPHNE, ALABAMA  
MARCH 6-9, 2007

Goal: Centralized Wetland Status and Trends Data base—

- GIS based
- USACE Central Repository
  - Standardized electronic data submittal
  - Electronic data submittal, permit application/verification requirement
  - Map authorized wetland impact areas
  - USACE process to allow for accounting (NED (economic) benefits in NER projects
  - Coordinate restoration activities with planning (i.e., dredge cycles)
  - Wave analysis as an erosional factor (ship traffic)

MS/AL Habitat Data Base—

<http://restoration.disl.org/www>

- Challenge – get people to enter and/or review data
- Encourage people to use data base
  - Need to validate usefulness
  - Unified state recommendations
  - Ensure data base is not cumbersome (data entry/data retrieval)
  - Easy download from other data bases.
- Need person dedicated to interfacing with agencies and entering data

Living Shoreline Restoration—

- Private landowner buy-in is difficult
- Landowners want assurances of success.
- Former marsh/wetlands prime targets for restoration
- Remember conservation, not just restoration
- Bang-for-the-buck
- Protective benefits of restoration project

[www.usace.army.mil](http://www.usace.army.mil)

MsCIP

251-694-4141

## IMPLEMENTING THE GOVERNORS' ACTION PLAN

### R-1

Step 1: --Need to include reps from Mexico

Quenton Dokken is working with people in Mexico to identify partners

--Need to capture Caribbean partners as well.

--Lack of leadership at the State level

How can we overcome the resource limitations/gaps to improve the leadership issue?

--Can State leads address that issue?

Overall state leads need to address this.

Alliance needs to be pushed at a higher level in each of the states.

This is a priority of Dr. Walker to spread the word: Alliance articles  
in State agency newsletters

Quenton Dokken, States, get together with Louisiana leadership

R1-1(7) Add States, Gulf of Mexico Foundation to Contributor/Collaborator

### R-1-2

--Formulate a plan for how info exchange continues once initial round robin meetings completed.

R-1-3 --TX finalized agreement. Robin Piker lead.

--Initial planning meeting next week, then getting speakers

--International speakers, speakers from other states desired

--Open to all aspects of freshwater inflows

--Should RRCT help to identify goals, outcomes for the conference?

Yes, on conference call as well as possibly a separate State level committee.

--Check NOAA info from John Klein 8-10 years ago.

--Texas is the lead. NGO's NWF, TNC

--FL – not necessary to host a workshop. Texas meeting will be Gulf-wide.

R1-4 --Some States attempt to get permission to take over environmental compliance permitting from ACE

MN and MI currently have authority

--States don't have the opportunity to comment during permitting process  
(National permitting required)

Add conditioning for states to approve Nationwide Permit

(Happening now)

- Lack of funding for ACE to do enforcement
  - State rejection of a Nationwide Permit does not mean individual can't move forward with restoration project. (As long as they have 401 certification)
  - Team permitting process (w/presentation from applicant) for large-scale projects has worked for Florida
    - Texas uses this method for ICT process
  - Solution/lesson 1: Better communications between agencies
    - 2: Institutionalize process?
  - Better communications may be more important than streamlining
  - Coastal Zone boundaries vary among States
    - AL is at 10-ft. contour, needs approval beyond
  - Full day or 2-day meeting on R1-4,5 issues to identify issues w/in each State and bring in other State experts
- Recommendation: For Regional Nationwide-State review and consistent w/State framework.

- R1-5
- Cautious about streamlining, need to make sure environmental regs. aren't lost.
  - Regulatory flexibility
  - Regulation process has not stopped restoration projects in Texas. This is a benefit and a necessity.
  - As it is written, this action is not a priority. R1-4 discussion/solutions covers the primary issues related to this action.
  - Streamlining happens through discussion/getting people involved on the front end --Opening a dialogue from the beginning (administration process vs. technical process)
    - Staffing is the bigger issue
    - Effective facilitators necessary

- R1-6
- Inconsistencies among federal grants
    - Common reporting requirements (where possible)
  - Adequate funding to do long-term monitoring necessary
  - Federal Clearinghouse for all federal grants
    - through one grant.
  - RRCT determines what they would like the Alliance FWD to look at
  - How much reporting is actually statutorily required?

- R1-7 "Supplement, not supplant"

## **R2 Discussion**

- Where are there data gaps in coastal monitoring?
- There needs to be another group to look at R2.
- This group did not sign up to do this (states)
- This is relevant, especially to Louisiana
- Heidi follows up with State leads to identify people in each State

to be involved. Possibly bring this new group to the Florida meeting for brief presentations.

--RRCT frames the issues related to R1 for R2 folks to look at.